

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-12 and 23-25 have been allowed.

Claims 3, 8, 9, 22 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 3, 8 and 9 have been amended to address issues of vagueness raised by the Examiner. These clarifications are not intended to alter the scope of the claim and do not add new matter.

Claims Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The Examiner objects to the term “modulo.” Though the term does not appear exactly in the specification as filed, one of skill in the art would recognize that the specification as filed shows a digital output computed modulo N, as recited in claim 22 and a first accumulator that increases modulo N and a second accumulator that increases modulo B, as recited in claim 26.

(Applicants have attached webpage printouts demonstrating that modular arithmetic and the term “modulo” are terms understood by those of skill in the art. As demonstrated in those attachments, modular arithmetic represents a system when numbers “wrap around” after they reach some maximum value. For example, FIG. 2 shows a register 46 having a finite number of bits. As is well known in the art, that number of bits defines a maximum value, N, that may be stored in register 46. If a value that is 1 larger than N is generated for storing in register 46, the most significant bits of that number are not stored. Rather, the least significant bits of that number are stored, resulting in a value of 1 being stored in register 46. Similarly, if a value 2 larger than N is generated, a value of 2 is stored in the register. The pattern continues in this fashion and the value in register 46 may be described as having been computed “modulo N.”

Likewise, the circuitry described in connection with remainder accumulator 50 never stores in register 54 a value larger than B. One of skill in the art would recognize that the circuitry of remainder accumulator 50 produces a value modulo B.

To avoid ambiguity, an express description using the term in the claims has been added to the specification. Because this description merely describes what was inherent in the specification as filed, it does not add new matter.


These amendments should address concerns expressed by the Examiner and the rejection should be removed.

Claims 3, 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for being indefinite. Clarifying amendments have been made to claims 3, 8 and 9. Therefore, this rejection should also be removed.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: December 8, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Edmund J. Walsh

Registration No.: 32,950

WOLF, GREENFIELD & SACKS, P.C.

Federal Reserve Plaza

600 Atlantic Avenue

Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2206

(617) 646-8000

x12/08/2005x